



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,518	12/05/2003	Guy Herriott	200314936-1	2391
22879	7590	06/13/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			SMITH, JOSHUA Y	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2609				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/13/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/729,518	HERRIOTT ET AL.
	Examiner Joshua Smith	Art Unit 2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received..

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/05/2003</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (Pub. No.: US 2002/0085554 A1) in view of Navada et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0214956 A1), hereafter referred to as Park and Navada, respectively.

As for Claim 1, Park teaches in paragraph [0034] of a “routing device 20 receives a packet from another node or routing device” (substantively the same as “receiving the data packet at a network device” in the instant invention).

Park shows in paragraph [0060] and in FIG. 5, Sheet 3 of 3, “if it is determined from the step S10 that the destination address of the packet is identical to the cache address found in the step S9” (substantively the same as “determining whether a ...

cache is hit by the data packet" in the instant invention), then "the main processor 11 sends the packet to the interface corresponding to the cache address" (substantively the same as "applying at least one cached action if the decision cache is hit" in the instant invention).

Park shows in paragraph [0056] and in FIG. 5, Sheet 3 of 3, "If the destination address of the packet is not identical to the cache IP address found in the step S9, the main processor 11 concludes that the destination address does not exist in the main cache table 11A. Therefore, it sends the packet to the protocol layer 12A (S30)", which "may be any one of the IP (Internet Protocol) layer 2A, IPX (Internetwork Packet exchange) layer 2B, Bridge layer 2C, and many others" (see paragraph [0006] and FIG. 1, Sheet 1 of 3, of Park) (substantively the same as "processing the data packet using software routines if the decision cache is missed" in the instant invention).

Park does not teach "multiple-key". However, in the same field of endeavor, Navada teaches in paragraphs [0028] and [0002], and Fig. 2, Sheet 2 of 8, "the key 216 may be a hardware address, software address, and/or VLAN tag", and "keys are typically Internet protocol (IP) addresses, media access control (MAC) addresses, virtual local area network (VLAN) tags, and other network identifiers" (substantively the same as "multiple-key" in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt the method of Navada into the method of Park since the method of Park does not explicitly involve fast VLAN lookups, while the method of Navada explicitly provides a detailed method of memory efficient fast VLAN lookups.

Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, and in further view of Kadambi et al. (Patent No.: US 6,643,261 B2), hereafter referred to as Kadambi. Park does not teach determining capability of hardware circuitry. However, in the same filed of endeavor, Kadambi teaches in lines 23-24, 29-30, 44-47, column 27, of a device that receives a packet and "If the packet is identified as neither an IP packet nor an IPX packet, the packet is directed to CPU", but the device could otherwise process a received IP packet or IPX packet since it can provide "support of both IP and IPX protocol", where this "capability is provided within logic circuitry". Kadambi teaches in lines 35-38, column 27, that this identification of packet type is done before cache lookup since packet type influences lookups (substantively the same as "prior to determining whether the multiple-key decision is hit" and "determining whether hardware circuitry of the network device is capable of processing the data packet" and "processing the data packet using hardware circuitry if the hardware circuitry is determined to be capable" in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt a form of the method of Park into the architecture of Kadambi since Kadambi provides a detailed architecture where at least aspects of Parks method can be implemented since both endeavor to improve the rate of forwarding though the use of caches and hashing.

Claims 3 and 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, and in further view of Musoll et al. (Patent No.: US 7,155,516 B2),

hereafter referred to as Musoll. Park does not teach determining whether an action by software is programmable into cache. However, in the same field of endeavor, Musoll teaches in lines 36-40, column 4, "steps of (a) attempting to store all incoming packets, by a first storage system, into a local packet memory (LPM)" and "(b) relinquishing packets incompatible with the LPM to a second storage system" (substantively the same as "determining whether action performed by the software routines is programmable into the multiple-key decision cache" and "programming a new entry into the multiple-key decision cache if the action performed is programmable" in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Musoll with the method of Park since, if the method of Park is implemented in hardware, Musoll provides a method of taking packets that cannot be processed by the hardware and efficiently conveying them to software-based processes.

Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, Musoll, and in further view of Spinney (Patent Number: 5,414,704), hereafter referred to as Spinney. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Navada teaches using multiple fields of a data packet. Navada does not teach hashing these fields and utilizing the result in a new table entry. However, in the same field of endeavor, Spinney teaches in lines 23-26, column 16, a packet's "hashed address 87 is used to index into the hash table 89 to select a hash bucket 90, and this selected hash bucket contains a pointer 93 into the translation table 94" (substantively the same as "a hash

value relating to multiple fields in the data packet is used in programming the new entry" in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt the method of Spinney into the method of Park since Spinney provides extensive details of efficiently searching a large database where a hashing function provides many collisions when dealing with large numbers of entries.

As for Claim 5, Navada teaches in paragraph [0028], "the key 216 may be a hardware address, software address, and/or VLAN tag included in the header of a data packet/datagram" and that "The content that is obtained from the key 216 is used to directly address and/or index into a table/memory location". Navada also teaches in paragraph [0029], "the reader 206 may also obtain the content by hashing all or part of the key" (substantively the same as "generating a hash value from multiple fields in the data packet" and "using the hash value generated to index into the multiple-key decision cache" in the instant invention).

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, and in further view of Lawler et al. (Patent Number: 5,978,951), hereafter referred to as Lawler. Park does not teach of an exclusive-or operation on packet IP addresses to generate a hash value. However, in the same field of endeavor, Lawler teaches in lines 60-62, column 14, of a device that "takes the sixteen bit CRCs generated on the SA and DA and XORs them together to generate a conversation based hash", where SA is Source Address, DA is Destination Address (see Lawler,

lines 61-62, column 3). (Substantively the same as “the hash value is generated by applying an exclusive-or operation to a source IP address and a destination IP address in the data packet” in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt the management unit of Lawler into the method of Park since Lawler provides an age table and detailed cache manipulations to provide flexible management that may be implemented to enhance the method of Park.

As for Claim 7, as discussed above with relation to Claim 1, Navada teaches “multiple-key”. Park further teaches in paragraphs [0053] and [0060], and FIG. 5, Sheet 3 of 3, “main processor 11 finds the cache address corresponding to the calculated Hashing key by searching the main cache table 11A (S9)”, and “if it is determined from the step S10 that the destination address of the packet is identical to the cache address found in the step S9, the main processor 11 sends the packet to the interface corresponding to the cache address (S1)” (substantively the same as “if the hash entry is valid in the ... decision cache, then determining whether pertinent fields of the data packet exactly match corresponding fields of the entry” and “if the pertinent fields exactly match, then providing a result that the decision cache is hit” in the instant invention). The motivation to combine the invention of Navada with the invention of Park is discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

As for Claim 8, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Navada teaches in paragraph [0002], “keys are typically Internet protocol (IP) addresses” (substantively the

same as “search keys for the decision cache include source and destination IP addresses” in the instant invention).

As for Claim 9, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Navada teaches in paragraph [0028], “the key 216 may be a ... VLAN tag” (substantively the same as “search keys further include an inbound VLAN identifier” in the instant invention).

As for Claim 10, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Navada teaches in paragraph [0002], “keys are typically ... media access control (MAC) addresses” (substantively the same as “search keys for the decision cache include source MAC addresses” in the instant invention).

Claims 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, and in further view Murthy et al. (Patent Number: 5,610,905), hereafter referred to as Murthy. Park does not teach of the clearing and possible population of a cache due to modification of a table. However, in the same field of endeavor, Murthy teaches in lines 51-53, column 14, and FIG. 12, Sheet 13 of 22, of a “Forwarding Table 80. This data structure is a two-dimensional array. One index of the array is RPORT 85”, and, in lines 34-37, column 16, if “the correspondence between SA 16 and RPORT 85 is found to be invalid, all Bridging Cache entries 79 with the corresponding SA 16 value in the RPORT sub-cache 77 must be cleared (the “flush” step in FIG. 16)”, with the intent that the cache will be refilled with valid entries as the

network device continues operation using the new RPORT value, and in lines 42-44, column 16, “the offending Bridging Cache entries 79 must be removed or, if it is more efficient, all cache entries may be invalidated” (substantively the same as “if a modification of a pertinent table is detected, then the decision cache is cleared and populated if possible” in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt the method of Park into the apparatus of Murthy since Park provides an efficient usage of two caches (a main cache and an instant cache) that can improve upon the cache system of Murthy.

Claim 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, Murthy, and in further view of Voit et al. (Patent No.: US 6,798,751 B1), hereafter referred to as Voit. Park does not teach of NAT table, ACL, layer 3 forwarding table, or layer 2 forwarding table. However, Navada teaches in paragraph [0022], “IP address, port address, and hardware address tables” (substantively the same as “a network layer 3 forwarding table, and a network layer 2 forwarding table” in the instant invention). The motivation to combine the invention of Navada with the invention of Park is discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

In the same field of endeavor, Voit teaches in lines 29-30, column 8, “access control lists”, and in line 64, column 33, “network address translations” (substantively the same as “a network address translation (NAT) table, an access control list (ACL)” in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt the method of Park into the equipment of Voit since Voit does not

explicitly include a cache table or a method in which to utilize it for faster processing and forwarding of packets.

Claim 13 appears to contain limitations in Claim 11, addressed above.

Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, and in further view of Murthy. Park does not teach that if a forwarding table is modified, a decision cache is cleared. However, as discussed above with respect to Claim 11, Murthy teaches in lines 51-53, column 14, and FIG. 12, Sheet 13 of 22, of a "Forwarding Table 80. This data structure is a two-dimensional array. One index of the array is RPORT 85", and, in lines 34-37, column 16, if "the correspondence between SA 16 and RPORT 85 is found to be invalid, all Bridging Cache entries 79 with the corresponding SA 16 value in the RPORT sub-cache 77 must be cleared (the "flush" step in FIG. 16)" (substantively the same as "if a modification of a pertinent table is detected, then a corresponding entry in the decision cache is cleared" in the instant invention). The motivation to combine the invention of Murthy with the invention of Park is discussed above with respect to Claim 11.

Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, and in further view of Luijten et al. (Patent Number: 6,023,466), hereafter referred to as Luijten. The references as applied to Claim 11 teach all the limitations except for a corresponding entry in the decision cache is updated. However,

in the same filed of endeavor, Luijten teaches in lines 27-29, column 4, "the entries to the LOOKUP RAM have to be kept directly addressable by the addresses to the corresponding entries of the SEARCH RAM. As a consequence, every update of the SEARCH RAM is accompanied by a corresponding update of the LOOKUP RAM" (substantively the same as "a corresponding entry in the decision cache is updated" in the instant invention). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to adopt the method of Luijten into the method of Park since Luijten provide detailed techniques in managing and searching two separate but cooperating memory units without the use of a hash.

Claims 16 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada and Kadambi.

As for Claim 16, the references as applied to Claims 1 and 2 teach all the limitations of the instant invention except for a plurality of ports and software routines. Park further shows in paragraph [0006], that every item 6 in FIG. 1, Sheet 1 of 3, that "a packet is received through a port 6", and port item 6 is a port among multiple ports (substantively the same as "a plurality of ports configured to receive data packets" in the instant invention).

Navada further teaches in paragraph [0050], of a packet switch that comprises "routines, subroutines, components, subcomponents, registers, processors, circuits, software subroutines, and/or software objects, or any combination thereof" (substantively the same as "software routines configures to process the data packets" in

the instant invention). The motivation to combine the invention of Navada with the invention of Park is discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 17 appears to contain limitations in Claim 2, addressed above.

Claims 18-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada and Kadambi.

Claim 18 appears to contain limitations in Claims 1, 2, addressed above.

Claims 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, Kadambi, and in further view of Spinney.

Claim 19 appears to contain limitations in Claims 4, 5, and 7, addressed above.

Claims 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Navada, Kadambi, Spinney, and in further view of Lawler.

Claim 20 appears to contain limitations in Claim 6, addressed above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Brown (Patent No.: US 6,862,287 B2) provides hashing technique. Greaves et al. (Pub. No.: US 2005/0111446 A1) provides caching and pattern matching techniques. Quinquis et al. (Patent Number: 5,638,377) provides table

management. Hong et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0048269 A1) provides management of cache servers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Smith whose telephone number is 571-270-1826. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Garber can be reached on 571-272-2194. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Yuyjen Pau" with a stylized, flowing script.